



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

We have no doubt that if we had had time to dive more deeply into the pages of Father Cressy, Father Colgan, William of Malmesbury, Johannes Capgrave, and the Acta Sanctorum, we might have added greatly to the list; but of those we have given—if there can be any choice among such edifying histories—we venture to state that the most satisfactory of all were the cases of St. Wenefride, the Venetian courtesan, St. Ita's workman Beanus, St. Paternus's servant, and the robin red-breast, as they were fully restored to life, which poor St. Edmund and the rest were not. We think the cases of St. Edmund and Count Wallen were altogether unsatisfactory ones, as, after the cementing process was gone through, the beheaded bodies unfortunately remained as dead as before. The cases of St. Denis, St. Decimanus, and the rest, who merely carried their heads to their places of burial, with or without the assistance of angels, we confess we never liked much, and have always wondered what the angels were about in not carrying the miracle a little further, unless, indeed, Angels have less supernatural power than Saints, and are only able to lead dead men, and not to cure them!

Will our readers allow us to ask one serious question before, in sober sadness, we close this article. If they do not believe in these traditions (as we are sure a great many intelligent Roman Catholics do not), but think them merely anile fables, unworthy of a moment's serious thought, what do they think of a Church which permits and encourages the circulation of such palpable falsehoods, and even records some of them in her authorised prayer book, the Breviary, which every Roman Catholic priest is compelled to read daily; while it discourages, if it does not prohibit, the reading of the inspired records of unerring truth?

RELIGIOUS TOLERATION AT ROME.

By the kindness of a friend, we have been provided with a copy of the "Theses on Religion of P. F. Joseph Palermo, of the Order of Eremites of St. Augustine," printed and published at Rome, A.D. 1823, in order to a public discussion.

We do not know whether any account of the discussion was published. We fear not; but if any of our friends could tell us anything about it, we should be grateful to them.

In the meantime, we publish some extracts from the "Theses." We shall then consider briefly what degree of importance is to be attached to the publication of such a work at Rome, so late as the year 1823.

We take Joseph Palermo's notions of "Religious Toleration" as a specimen of the doctrines which he published at Rome, and undertook publicly to defend.

In page 17, after some discussion about religious toleration, he lays down this conclusion, "Let it fall headlong into hell, from whence it broke forth, with its snake-haired forehead, that most impious and most insane religious toleration!"

Joseph Palermo then goes on to show the application and the grounds of his doctrine about religious toleration, as follows:—

"Therefore, let the public exercise of religions opposed to the Catholic (he means the Roman) be forbidden by Catholic Princes, UNLESS CHRISTIAN PRUDENCE HINDER IT; for, indeed, each ought to do to others what he ought REASONABLY to wish to be done to himself by others; but princes, if they were subjects, ought to wish that princes, by every better method which Christian prudence would teach them, would employ themselves to drive away every cause of their eternal misery, if it were only a probable cause of it; therefore, the princes themselves are bound to fulfil this for their subjects."

This appears to us a good instance of the power of argument which some Roman Catholics possess. Our Saviour says, "All things, therefore, whatsoever you would that men should do to you, do you also to them" (Matthew vii., 12.). "There, you see! (says Joseph Palermo) princes ought to punish every one who differs from them, for worshipping God according to his own conscience!"

We ask our Roman Catholic readers to consider what they would think of this argument, if the Protestant government of England were to act towards them on the reasoning of Joseph Palermo?

But "heretics" are unreasonable beasts: they ought to be persecuted, and they *would* wish it!

But Joseph Palermo proceeds, a little farther on—"Wherefore, unless that condition exist (Christian prudence hindering it), it is very gravely unlawful to tolerate the public exercise of the religion of the Mahomedans, Jews, Calvinists, Lutherans, and of all others opposed to ours, especially of Atheists."

* Ruat igitur ad orbem, unde angustiora fronte erupit, implissima, et insanissima religiosa tolerantia.

† Stricto iudicio a Catholicis principibus vetetur publicum religionum Catholicæ oppositarum exercitium, nisi obstat Christiana prudentia: enim vero unusquisque debet aliis facere, quod rationabiliter debet velle sibi ab aliis fieri: atqui Principes, si forent subditi, deberent velle, ut Principes omni meliori modo, quem ipsos doceret Christiana prudentia, satagerent ab ipsis arcere quancunque etiam tantummodo probabiliem causam suis internæ infelicitatis; ergo et ipsi pro suis subditis hoc implere tenentur." Page 17.

‡ Quare, nisi adistat conditio, graviter illicitum est tollerare publicum exercitium religionis Mahomedanorum, Hebræorum, Calvinistarum, Lutheranorum, cæterarumque omnium nostræ adversantium, præsertim Atheistarum. Page 17.

We never before heard of ATHEISTS having public worship: we suppose they are put into the list of "public worshippers" only to try to throw disgrace on "all others opposed to ours"—that is, on Christian churches not subject to Rome.

What a glorious day it would be for the Church of Rome, if she could effectually prohibit every man throughout the whole world to worship God except as the Pope may now please—or as he may hereafter please, according to doctrines not yet promulgated or invented!

But what is the meaning of "that condition," i.e. "unless Christian prudence hinder it?"

The Waldenses were exterminated in the 13th century. The Protestants were massacred in France on St. Bartholomew's Day. In England, in Queen Mary's reign, all who dared to worship God according to their conscience were burnt alive. Three or four years ago, the present Pope entered into a "concordat" with Spain (now happily set aside by Espartero), that any Spaniard who worshipped God otherwise than as a Romanist should be consigned to a dungeon.

"Christian prudence" forbade none of these things; because the sufferers were weak, and the power of arms was against them. But at the present day, Joseph Palermo would not enforce such laws in England, or France, or America, because the thing could not be done; and "Christian prudence" forbids the Church of Rome to attempt such things where she would certainly be beat; just as "Christian prudence" admonished the Russians to march out of Sebastopol when they could stay in it no longer.

But what if Joseph Palermo did print and publish these persecuting doctrines at Rome? Is the Church of Rome answerable for that? So Roman Catholics in this country may ask, and they are entitled to an answer.

We reply, that at Rome no person is allowed to print any book until he first gets the sanction and authority of the Church of Rome for doing so. This is a law of the Church of Rome, made by a Pope and General Council, in the year 1515.

"We appoint and ordain that for all future times no one shall print, or cause to be printed, in our city (Rome) any book or other writing, of whatever kind, unless they be first diligently examined in this city by our Vicar and Master of the Sacred Palace, and APPROVED by subscription of their own hand."

This law was made by Pope Leo X., in the Fifth General Council of Lateran, A.D. 1515.

This law is still in force at Rome, and under this law Joseph Palermo's book, which undertakes to defend these outrageous notions about religious toleration, was actually approved for publication. For thus we find it printed at the end of the book:

IMPRIMATUR

Si vid. Rev. Patri Mag. Sac. Pal. Apost. J. Della Porta Patriarcha Constantinopol. Pro-Vic.

IMPRIMATUR

F. Philippus Anfossi. Sac. Pal. Ap. Mag.

Thus, this book of Joseph Palermo's was formally sanctioned at Rome, in the year 1823, by the two officials—the Pope's Vicar, and the Master of the Sacred Palace—who were specially appointed by the Pope and a General Council to examine and approve of books before they can be printed.

It certainly appears that the teaching and defending of such doctrines as Joseph Palermo's does not meet any discouragement at Rome; and it is fortunate that the Joseph Palermos of the Church of Rome have the "Christian prudence" not to attempt putting their doctrines in practice where people are able to resist them.

Since the above was written, we have found reason to think that Joseph Palermo's doctrine about religious toleration has found great encouragement at Rome.

We find in the *Tablet* of August 25, p. 532, the following announcement:—"The most Rev. Father Paul Micallef, a native of Malta, has been appointed by the Pope General of the Order of St. Augustine. He succeeds the late General, the most Rev. Father JOSEPH PALERMO, who has resigned, by reason of his promotion to the Episcopacy and office of Sacristan and Confessor in Ordinary to his Holiness."

We suppose this is the Joseph Palermo who wrote the Theses on religious toleration. His opinions, it seems, are not an obstacle, but rather a recommendation for promotion. The fact of his being made Confessor to the Pope, and director of the Pope's conscience, is a significant circumstance, in the present state of Spain, Sardinia, &c., and of Rome itself.

If Joseph Palermo had written a book in favour of "religious toleration," and had undertaken to prove that princes ought not to persecute any man for worshipping God according to his own conscience, would he have got leave to publish his book at Rome, and would he have been made CONFESSOR TO THE POPE?

* Statimque et ordinamus quod de cetero perpetuis futuris temporibus nullus librum aliquem seu aliam quancunque scripturam in urbe nostra . . . imprimere seu imprimi facere præsumat, nisi prius in urbe per Vicarium nostrum at Sacri Palatii magistrum . . . diligenter examinetur, et per eorum munus propria subscriptione approbentur. CONCIL LATERAN V., Sess. 10. LABRE & COES, vol. xiv., p. 257. The words omitted provide for the same being done with books printed in other places. On this subject, see CATHOLIC LAYMAN for October, 1853, p. 110, 11.

THE SUCCESSION OF THE ARCHBISHOPS OF DUBLIN.

In our number for August, 1854, we published an article "On the Succession of the Irish Bishops."

In that article we quoted the following passage from the "Historia Catholica" of Philip O'Sullivan Bear:—"There are four archbishoprics in Ireland, and a great many bishoprics, and ALL of them, at this day, are possessed by the leaders of Heresy; and on account of that, Catholic Prelates ARE NOT APPOINTED to the Titles of them, EXCEPT ON RARE OCCASIONS."

This was published in 1621—EIGHTY-SIX years after the beginning of the Reformation in Ireland.

This evidence, from a Roman Catholic historian, is decisive against the common boast of Roman Catholic priests, that the Church of Rome has kept up an unbroken succession from the ancient Bishops of Ireland, in all the Irish Sees.

In our number for October, 1854, we published "The Succession of St. Patrick," showing an uninterrupted succession up to Lord John Beresford, the present Primate of Ireland.

We then called on "all Roman Catholic archbishops in Ireland (especially Dr. Dixon), on all Roman Catholic bishops, priests, and laymen, to send us a list of Roman Catholic archbishops (of Armagh) in succession from Primate Cromer, with the dates of the vacancies and appointments, and the proofs of each."

We did not expect that such a list would be sent to us, because we knew well that no list can be given of a Roman Catholic succession at Armagh, which could stand examination for one moment.

A YEAR has now elapsed; and no Roman Catholic has ever ventured to send us such a list!

We now call on all Roman Catholics to mark this striking fact; and we ask them again, are they willing to let it thus appear to the world that they have no succession FROM ST. PATRICK?

Will any Roman Catholic now send us such a list?

We now proceed to give "the succession of the Archbishops of Dublin." We give this succession in a different form from that of Armagh. No Roman Catholic author that we know of, has published the Roman succession of Armagh; we therefore gave only the succession of the Irish Church in the See of Armagh, leaving it to Roman Catholics to furnish the Roman succession. But Mr. D'Alton, an Irish Roman Catholic barrister, and a learned Irish historian, has published a valuable history of the Archbishops of Dublin. At the end of this work (page 370, to the end), he has given the Roman archbishops of Dublin. Here, therefore, we are able to give the Roman succession, as stated by a learned Roman Catholic. We, therefore, give BOTH successions in the See of Dublin; and we ask our readers to consider which of them is really a succession. We give the succession of archbishops of the Irish Church, from Harris's edition of Ware's Irish Bishops, down to John Hoadley, who was archbishop of Dublin in the year 1739, when that work was published; and we complete the account from a list made from the Registers themselves. The succession is acknowledged on both sides down to John Allen, who was murdered by the Fitzgeralds in the year 1534. We therefore begin with his successor, George Browne, who was Provincial of Augustine Friars in England, and who, while he held that office, "advised the people to make their applications to Christ alone; for which doctrine he was much taken notice of." As archbishop of Dublin, he never acknowledged any subjection to the bishop of Rome, but exerted himself to the utmost to have all things ordered in the Irish Church according to the Word of God.

We take up the Roman succession where Mr. D'Alton enables us to do so.

THE SUCCESSION OF ARCHBISHOPS IN THE IRISH CHURCH.	THE ROMAN SUCCESSION.
George Browne, from 1535 to 1554.	No Roman archbishop, for twenty years.
Hugh Curwen, from 1555 to 1567.	Curwen in communion with Rome for three years only; 1555—1558.
Adam Loftus, from 1567 to 1605.	No Roman archbishop of Dublin from 1558 to A.D. 1611. Matthew de Oviedo was nominated by the Pope, in 1600, but was not consecrated.
Thomas Jones, from 1605 to 1619.	Eugene Matthews, from 1611 to 1623.
Lancelot Bulkeley, from 1619 to 1660.	Thomas Fleming, from 1623 to 1666.
James Margetson, from 1660 to 1663.	
Michael Boyle, from 1663 to 1678.	Peter Talbot, from 1669 to 1680.
John Parker, from 1678 to 1681.	
Francis Marsh, from 1681 to 1693.	Patrick Russell, from 1683 to 1692.
Narcissus March, from 1694 to 1702.	Peter Creagh, from 1693. Time of his death not known.
William King, from 1702 to 1729.	Edmund Byrne, from 1707. Time of his death not known.
	Edward Murphy, from 1724 to

* Historia Catholica, p. 297. Dublin, 1850. Edited by the Rev. Matthew Kelly, Professor of the College of Maynooth.

John Hoadley, from 1729 to 1743.
 Charles Cobbe, from 1743 to 1765.
 Wm. Carmichael, from 1765 to 1766.
 Arthur Smyth, from 1766 to 1772.
 John Cradock, from 1772 to 1778.
 Robert Fowler, from 1778 to 1803.
 Earl of Normanton, from 1803 to 1809.
 Euseby Cleaver, from 1809 to 1819.
 Lord John G. Beresford, from 1819 to 1822.
 Wm. Magee, from 1822 to 1831.
 Richard Whately, from 1831 to present time.

From the above table it appears, *first*, that there was always a succession of archbishops in the See of Dublin, in which succession the present Archbishop Whately now stands. *Second*, that there was no Romanist archbishop of Dublin for 76 years (from 1535 to 1611), with the exception of three years (from 1555 to 1558; for Hugh Curwen renounced obedience to the pope in 1559). Therefore, it is the Irish Church, and not the Roman Church, which has succession in the See of Dublin.

Matthew de Oviedo, who was nominated by the Pope in 1600, was *not* a bishop. He was a political agent of the King of Spain, sent over by him to carry on war against the Queen of England; and the Pope, to give credit to his mission, gave him the title *only* of archbishop of Dublin, by naming him as the person to be appointed to that See; but Oviedo was not consecrated. This appears from the fact that Peter Lalor was "Vicar General of the Apostolic See," in the Diocese of Dublin, in 1606, and had been so for many years*—showing that while Oviedo was living, the Pope had only a vicar-general, and not an archbishop, in the See of Dublin. The fact was, that if Ireland had been conquered by the King of Spain, Oviedo *was to have been made* the Pope's archbishop in Dublin. But as Ireland was *not* conquered, he never was consecrated; and he never set foot in Dublin. Our readers may see another case of the same kind in our article "On the Succession of the Irish Bishops," in our number for August, 1854.

Thus, for SEVENTY-SIX years (that is, from 1535 to 1611, omitting the three first years of Hugh Curwen), the Pope never had an archbishop in the See of Dublin.

It is, therefore, mere ignorance now to boast of a succession of Roman Catholic archbishops in the See of Dublin.

When Eugene Matthews was appointed by the bishop of Rome in 1611, Thomas Jones, a Catholic prelate, holding the Catholic creeds, and canonically consecrated, was in legitimate possession of the See of Dublin. The appointment of Eugene Matthews to a See which was then canonically filled, was unlawful and void. By the laws of the Catholic Church, there can be but one bishop in a See; and a second bishop appointed to a See in which there is a bishop already, is *NO BISHOP*.

Eugene Matthews, and all his successors, labour under this sentence. By the laws of the Catholic Church, none of them are bishops.

We ask, will any Roman Catholic lawyer have the boldness to discuss this question in our pages?

We further affirm, that no law or canon of the Catholic Church has given to the Bishop of Rome a power to nominate or appoint the other bishops of Christendom.

If any such law or canon can be produced, let it be sent to us, and we will publish it.

How long will Roman Catholics fail to answer every such challenge of ours?

They cannot answer, until truth shall change sides. There lies the rub!

THE RESURRECTION OF THE BODY.

We have ever held it to be one of the heaviest charges against the Church of Rome, that she has made additions to the articles of the Christian Faith, as handed down in the Catholic creed.

Twelve new articles, added to the creed fifteen hundred years after the time of Christ, can have no claim to be "the faith once delivered to the saints."

Roman Catholics, however, do not easily see the greatness of this offence. Their priests are naturally more anxious about upholding the new articles than the old ones; partly because the old are able to stand alone, and the new are not; and partly because those who study the Scriptures do not attack the old articles, and do attack the new ones. Thus Roman Catholics hear much about the importance of the new articles and but little, perhaps, about the old ones.

If Roman Catholics really understood the importance of "the articles of the Christian faith"—if they knew how those articles do meet the wants of men's souls, and appeal to the affections of their hearts—they would be more jealous of the inventions and additions of men.

Such an understanding of the Creed, as containing the

great truths proposed by God himself to occupy our minds and engage our hearts, is also a strong confirmation of our faith, in addition to the great argument of prophecy which we stated in our last number.

We wish, therefore, to call attention to the articles of the ancient Creed.

We designedly begin with that article of the creed which, perhaps, our readers may have the most overlooked—"the resurrection of the body."

Mankind have always been anxious and uneasy about their future destiny after death; for of all creatures in this world, God has made man alone capable of looking beyond the grave.

The heathen nations always believed in the immortality of the soul. Some small sects among them denied it, as the Sadducees did among the Jews; but the mass of the heathen, not being led by the false philosophy of the few, always believed in the immortality of the soul and a future existence.

The Latin poet, Virgil, who lived not long before the birth of Christ, has left us an account of the popular belief about that future existence, with its rewards and punishments.

He has succeeded well in describing the torments of the damned, and well, too, in describing the process by which the heathen believed that souls were gradually purged of the stains of sin—a description which has been largely adopted into the debased Christianity of later ages.*

But his description of heaven, though he did his best to make it attractive, is such as *NO LIVING MAN* could wish to obtain in exchange for this life.

In his description, the whole state of the dead appears cold and dreary in the extreme—

"Regions void of light,
 Through the vast empire of eternal night."

And every attempt to ascribe happiness to the dead only makes the unreality of the scene the more painful—

"But reach your hand, oh parent shade, nor shun
 The dear embraces of your longing son!
 He said, and falling tears his face bedew.
 Then thrice around his neck his arms he threw,
 And thrice the flitting shadow slept away,
 Like winds, or empty dreams that fly the day."
 (Dryden's *Virgil*, Book vi., 948.)

Existence like a dream can never be an object of desire to man.

If Virgil's heaven contains one object of desire, it arises from the doctrine of the transmigration of souls—

"Those happy spirits which, ordained by fate,
 For future beings and new bodies wait."

Yet what an object of desire!—

"That, unremembering of its former pain,
 The soul may suffer mortal flesh again."

Yet, doubtless, such an offer would have been gladly embraced by any shade in Virgil's heaven.

So cold and dreary was the brightest conception that a heathen could form of happiness in a life to come.

There must have been—and there was—a reason for this failure.

God created the first man, Adam, a being composed of body and soul; Adam, so created, was immortal; he was always to have body and soul united. But when Adam sinned, the sentence went forth that he must die: and so death passed upon all men (Romans v. 12).

"Death" did not mean that his soul should cease to exist; it meant the destruction of the body and the separation of the soul.

The state of a disembodied spirit, is, therefore, the state of death.

Virgil, knowing the immortality of the soul, but being ignorant of the resurrection of the body, could only describe the *state of the dead*; and, do what he would to make that state seem happy, the inmost feeling of mankind, more true than man's philosophy, turns, and will ever turn, with instinctive aversion from the hateful picture. The "rising from the dead" (Mark ix. 10) can alone be the hope of immortality.

Alas, that many Christians should have no higher notion of the life to come than the heathen had!

Their minds are turned away from the articles of the Christian faith, and fixed on the inventions of men. The doctrine of the *heathen* poet and the Council of Trent, that "there is a purgatory," is ever before their eyes; the CHRISTIAN doctrine of "the resurrection of the body," never! and, consequently, their great concern about the life to come, is how they may *escape* from the torments of purgatory—not how they may "attain unto the resurrection of the dead" (Philippians iii. 11).

Most of our readers are probably conscious, that their notions of HEAVEN are so cold and gloomy that to them it is hardly an object of desire. If they *must* die, they would rather go there than to hell or purgatory; but if they could choose for themselves, they would rather stay in this world than do either.

This feeling does not altogether proceed from a fear of the judgment of God; it proceeds in part from not being fit for the enjoyments of heaven; but it proceeds in great part, too, from not understanding the state of existence we shall have in the life to come—from not believing and understanding the resurrection of the dead.

For, independent of the sense of guilt and the fear of judgment, the idea of being a mere disembodied spirit is repulsive to the nature of man; because that is not the

state of existence for which God created man, nor is it the state to which God designs to restore him; and the *cravings* of man's nature can be satisfied by that alone for which God created man. Therefore, the notion of being a mere spirit, stript of the body, must ever produce in the soul a sense of shrinking and shivering, like that which going naked would produce in the body.

But if the body shall be raised out of the grave, and body and soul again become a living man, then man triumphs over death; and if the body, risen from the grave, shall be freed from all the sickness, pain, and weakness, which it now suffers in consequence of sin—if it rise glorious and incorruptible, as Adam's body was before he fell—then every desire of immortality which man is naturally capable of forming, is fulfilled in the life to come. All this, and more, the scripture promises.

St. Paul acknowledges the nakedness of a disembodied spirit, and promises something better; when speaking of the present body, he says—"In this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house that is from heaven; if so be that being clothed, we shall not be found naked. For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened: *not that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon*, that mortality might be swallowed up of life" (2 Cor. v. 2-4).

The Corinthians erred (not like the Sadducees, by denying the existence of spirits), but by doubting the resurrection of the body; and to them the apostle says—"Now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first fruits, them that slept. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive" (1 Cor. xv. 20, 21). And God who giveth a new body to the seed which rots under the earth, can raise up again that body which death has consigned to the worms and the dust.

That very body shall be raised, but how changed! "It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption: it is sown in dishonour; it is raised in glory: it is sown in weakness; it is raised in power: it is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body" (1 Cor. xv. 42-44).

It is true that "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God," any more than corruption can inherit incorruption (verse 50); but there are celestial (or heavenly) bodies, as well as terrestrial (or earthly) bodies (verse 40): there is also a "spiritual body," as well as a "natural body" (verse 44).

The "natural body" is that which we now have; the "spiritual body" is that which Christ now has. And as we have borne the image of fallen Adam by having a body like his, so shall we bear the image of Christ by having a body like his (1 Cor. xv. 49).

For Christ "shall change our vile body that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body" (Phil. iii. 21).

What that "glorious body" is, he showed at his transfiguration on the Mount, when "his face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light" (Matthew xvii. 2).

Christ was then—and he is now—in his glorious body; and he has promised to "change our vile bodies that they may be like to his glorious body."

And then, "when this corruptible body shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal body shall have put on immortality, THEN shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, DEATH IS SWALLOWED UP IN VICTORY" (1 Cor. xv. 54).

Who has not stood by the grave of a parent or a child, a wife or a husband, or some one who was dear, and *felt* the reign of death? Who does not shudder at the thought of lying down like them in the grave? Who does not long that "Death, the last enemy, shall be destroyed?" (1 Cor. xv. 26).

There was a grave once by which Jesus stood and called, "Lazarus, come forth. And he that was dead came forth" (John xi. 43, 44).

Lazarus came back into a world of woe: yet was there joy at his rising from the dead.

But "the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the grave shall hear his voice, and shall come forth" (John v. 28). They that are his, with glorious incorruptible bodies, to "new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness" (2 Peter iii. 13).

Until that victory over death be won, we "wait for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body" (Rom. viii. 23). And, therefore, it is placed among "the articles of the Christian faith," as that which can animate all our hopes, and give an object to all our desires, "I believe in the resurrection of the body."

All this, we know too well, is nothing to all those whose hearts are yet possessed with the natural enmity of fallen man to holiness and to God (Rom. viii. 7). But to those who are seeking for Christ's salvation—whose minds are in any degree conformed to Christ—to them, we believe, there is no greater encouragement and help than to know that "the things which God has prepared for them that love him," are indeed the things that are able to supply all the desires which their nature is capable of forming.

If such should desire to learn *more* of "the articles of the Christian faith," we will endeavour to meet such desires.

In the meantime, we ask them to consider that it is not without reason that we "earnestly contend for the faith once delivered to the saints" (Jude 3); and that we are so jealous lest that faith should be overborne by the inventions and corruptions of men?

* Davis' Reports; Premature Case.

* See the CATHOLIC LAYMAN for May, 1853, page 58.